SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VII, No. 2 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | February 1, 1977

Carter's R&D Team: Vacancies Still Abound

The science and health agencies in Washington currently resemble a flock of untended sheep, anxiously wondering when the shepherds are coming on duty.

They, of course, will eventually arrive, probably in the next month or so. But in the meantime, the new Administration is off and running — with virtually every top-level research-policy position in the vast federal bureaucracy either vacant or occupied by a holdover of uncertain tenure.

About a week before inauguration, Mr. Carter named his White House staff, with one omission, a director for the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), which, paradoxically, is one of the few presidential staff positions created by an Act of Congress. Meanwhile, the top health official in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Theodore Cooper, was advised that the new Administration is not sympathetic to his desire to stay on as Assistant Secretary for Health; he's out. And at the National Institutes of Health, Director Donald Fredrickson has had no sign about his future. He's been in the post for only 18 months, and has been successfully functioning as a peacemaker following four years of administrative turmoil, firings and resignations in NIH's top echelons. The National Science Foundation continues under an Acting Director, Richard Atkinson, who ascended to the top spot in the last months of the Ford Administration. Atkinson, who would like to stay on, but not as Acting Director, has had no signal about his future.

Ford's Last Budget: Another Boost for R&D—Page 4

The Environmental Protection Agency is headed on an acting basis by former Deputy Administrator John R. Quarles Jr., following the resignation of Russell Train. The same goes for the Energy Research and Development Administration, where former Deputy Administrator Robert W. Fri took over from Robert C. Seamans Jr., who stays on the premises as a consultant. ERDA's future is the most clouded of all the research agencies on the federal landscape, since Mr. Carter has repeatedly vowed to reorganize the government's sprawling energy empire and has installed James C. Schlesinger in the White House as head of a newly created Energy Resources Council. The Council is apparently to function as the overlord of energy until the reorganization is accomplished, but since Congress will have to approve any serious reallocation of energy jurisdictions, it is not likely that anything will happen quickly.

NASA, too, is in a kind of leadership limbo. Administrator James C. Fletcher went through the form of submitting his resignation to the new President, but not having had a reply, or even an informal clue, was still on the job last week.

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Latest research superstars to figure in published speculation about appointments to the Carter Administration: Wolfgang Panofsky, director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator, and Richard Garwin, of IBM. They're said to be under consideration for posts at the Defense Department. Veterans of the Washington advisory network, both have long been associated with the arms-control movement.

Guy Stever left office as presidential science adviser January 20, vowing to associates that he plans to refrain from public commentary on research policy for a substantial length of time. According to an aide, Stever said, "The new team doesn't need advice from the old players." Stever continues to reside in Washington, is pondering several offers, but says he's in no hurry to go to work.

DuPont, the company of Better Things for Better Living Through Chemistry, is moving cautiously these days in research. Its 1977 R&D budget calls for a mere 3 per cent growth, which means a 3 per cent drop in real dollars. Richard E. Heckert, a senior vice president, recently told a group of security analysts that "improvement of established businesses will take three-quarters or more of our R&D outlays in contrast with the two-thirds it has taken in recent years."

An organization that describes itself as "a national association of persons involved in the grantsmanship field" is being formed by a group of East and West Coast academics. Titled, the National Association of Grant Writers, its acting director is Howard L. Shenson, who teaches business administration at California State, Northridge. The Association's address is: Suite 215, 16400 Ventura Blvd., Encino, Calif. 91436. Tel. (213)783-6250.

. . . R&D Left out of the Formative Period

(Continued from Page 1)

Some of the delays in filling the research-related posts are attributable to the normal difficulties of setting up shop. Also, the obvious lack of urgency reflects a general feeling on the part of the Carter transition team that the government's research programs are in comparatively good shape and do not require priority attention. But a good deal of the delay can also be attributed to the uncertainties that have been generated by the reorganization promises of the new Administration. With the grand reorganization scheme yet to be formulated in detail, it is difficult to recruit people for second-line jobs in agencies that have uncertain futures.

One consequence of the vacancies and uncertain tenures is that the R&D community is virtually excluded from the formative stages of the new Administration. Time will eventually wash out that effect. But as one old science-policy hand observed to SGR, the pre- and early post-inaugural days of a new Administration are a period in which acquaintanceships and alliances are formed, schemes are conceived and hatched, and ways of doing things are established. And in the large cast of characters now engaged in this process, there are few indeed who are there to speak in behalf of research and development.

One matter on which it would be useful to have them speak is the budget that the Ford Administration bequeathed to its successor for Fiscal Year 1978, which begins next October 1. Opinions vary as to how much opportunity Carter really has for significantly amending that budget to his own likes. Time is against him, since budget formulating is a long and unwieldy process; moreover, Congress has to get on with its review of some budget and the Ford budget is there to review right now. But for reasons of pride and program, the Carter Administration will strive as mightily as it can to disassemble and recast as much of the Ford budget as it possibly can. And as things now stand, Carter's R&D appointees will probably still be unpacking when that process is in full flow.

At a press briefing on the R&D portion of the budget, held three days before Inauguration Day, Guyford Stever, the outgoing presidential science adviser, expressed confidence that the Ford budget would remain more or less intact under Carter. The reason he offered was that major R&D programs take years to formulate, organize, and get into operation; furthermore, he said, when Carter's appointees go looking for advice, "the experts will give them the same advice they gave us."

The process, of course, isn't predestined as all that, but Stever, who sweated through four budgets as part-time and, later, full-time presidential science adviser, knows the process well. To the extent that Carter can sensibly modify his predecessor's R&D budget, the opportunities are being eroded by delays in appointing the people who will be responsible for R&D in the new Administration.

From the perspective of the relationship between science and politics, the situation is peculiar. The Carter Administration, ironically, represents a modern high-point in the ascent of technically trained people to political office. Mr. Carter, after all, is an engineer of sorts, and his Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, is a full-fledged physicist of considerable professional distinction. That's more than C.P. Snow ever hoped for in his anguishing over antidotes for scientific illiteracy in high political places.

But the problem isn't at the top. It's down there are the assistant level.—DSG

A New Pitch for Physics

The elders of the scientific community are well-versed at invoking picturesque rhetoric in behalf of the budgets for their trade, and none more so than the practitioners of high-energy physics, which bears the treble burden of being costly, useless, and incomprehensible to laymen. Thus, a few years ago, the high-energy fraternity argued that their immense particle accelerators are the spiritual equivalents of the great cathedrals of medieval times, and therefore merit society's support.

The latest resort to colorful language comes from Wolfgang Panofsky, director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator, which shows up in the federal budget for $80 million next year.

Addressing himself to whether the figure — written in by Ford's budgetmakers — would be accepted by the Carter Administration, Panofsky said he felt certain it would.

The reason, he explained, is that high-energy physics has become a "national trust."

NSF Sets up Small Business Office

The National Science Foundation has established an Office of Small Business Research and Development to assist small firms that want to work on NSF programs. It will collect and publish data on NSF dealings with small business, and report to Congress, which has been prodding NSF about its slight links to small business. The Director is Theodore W. Wirths, former head of NSF's Office of Government and Public Programs.

Rep. McCormack Fails in Bid for Nuclear Committee Post

In what is being interpreted as a successful move to keep Rep. Mike McCormack (D-Wash) from gaining too much authority over legislation dealing with energy research and development, Democrats on the House Committee on Science and Technology last week assigned the chairmanship of a key energy subcommittee to Rep. Walter Flowers (D-Ala); McCormack, meanwhile, was given only a relatively minor subcommittee.

During the past four years, McCormack has been highly active in energy matters and has played an influential role in developing legislation dealing with energy R&D. His authority stemmed from his membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, where he chaired a special investigation of the breeder program, and his chairmanship last session of a Science and Technology subcommittee which had authority over many of the Energy Research and Development Administration's (ERDA) non-nuclear programs.

Following the abolition earlier this year of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Science and Technology Committee picked up authority over nuclear R&D, and it was widely anticipated that McCormack would end up with the chairmanship of a subcommittee dealing with most of the federal government's energy R&D programs. His enthusiasm for the nuclear program — he was once a nuclear researcher — and his often abrasive style have won him a number of critics, however.

Democrats on the Science and Technology Committee met on January 25 to carve up the committee's responsibilities. They decided, after considerable discussion, to form seven subcommittees, two of which would deal with energy matters. The more important would have authority over R&D on fossil energy, fission energy, nuclear fusion, and nuclear fuel cycle technologies, while the other would deal with solar and geothermal energy, energy conservation, and basic research supported by ERDA.

When it came time to assign the chairmanships of the committees, Flowers, who ranks above McCormack in seniority, claimed chairmanship of the fossil and nuclear subcommittee, leaving McCormack with the solar, geothermal, and conservation subcommittee. Flowers's views on energy matters are little known since he hasn't previously played an active role in energy policy.

In the Science and Technology Committee reorganization, Rep. Ray Thornton (D-Ark) was assigned the chairmanship of the subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, which has oversight over the National Science Foundation. Rep. Don Fuqua (D-Fla) retained his chairmanship of the space subcommittee, Rep. George Brown (D-Calif) was given the chairmanship of a subcommittee on Environment and Atmosphere, Rep. James Scheuer (D-NY) was assigned chairmanship of a subcommittee which has special oversight over federal R&D and international cooperation, and Rep. Dale Milford (D-Tex) ended up with chairmanship of a subcommittee on aviation and weather. —CN

Faster Patent Review on DNA

The Department of Commerce has announced that it will speed up the processing of applications for patents involving the use of recombinant DNA techniques because of the "exceptional importance of recombinant DNA and the desirability of prompt disclosure of developments in the field."

The announcement, published in the January 13 *Federal Register,* also states that patent applications must be accompanied by a written statement to the effect that experiments on which the patent is based are being carried out in accordance with NIH's recombinant DNA safety guidelines, though the applicant may "include an explanation of any deviations (from the guidelines) considered essential to avoid disclosure of proprietary information."

A number of patent applications, involving recombinant DNA techniques, including one from the University of California and Stanford University, have already been filed. (SGR Vol. VI, No. 11).

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1977

Contributing Editors
Colin Norman, Pamela Moore

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg
European Correspondent
Michael Kenward (London)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $75 (two years, $140); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Ford's Last Budget Seeks Boost for Research

The budget that the Ford Administration left behind continues a three-year pattern aimed at making up for past sparse support for R&D and keeping the research enterprise a step ahead of inflation. As far as R&D is concerned, it is not a bountiful budget, but relative to other federal concerns, science and technology are treated quite well. Overall, they are slated for an 8 per cent increase in a Fiscal Year 1978 — commencing next October 1 — for which inflation is forecast at 6 per cent.

Research related to national security — Defense, plus the military programs of NASA and ERDA — account for well over half of the R&D budget, a division that goes back to early Cold War days. NIH is held to a mere $40-million increase in obligations, obviously in anticipation of Congress's tradition of laying on its own increases for health research. NSF goes up by 11 per cent, with special emphasis on making up for recent lags in the acquisition of scientific equipment in the universities.

It is impossible to predict the durability of a Ford R&D budget in the first year of a Carter Administration, especially when the subject of R&D was virtually untouched during the campaign and the new Administration's R&D team is yet to arrive. Probably the most powerful factor is the combined complexity and momentum of the programs that are written into the budget. They are not immutable, but neither are they easily killed off, expanded, or modified.

(Details of the Ford budget are in the accompanying boxes).

Federal Research and Development
Obligations ($ Millions)

	1976	1977	1978	1977-1978
Conduct of R&D				
Defense	9,592	11,132	12,317	+ 11%
NASA	3,488	3,800	3,833	+ 1%
ERDA	2,499	3,610	4,064	+ 13%
HEW	2,543	2,910	2,976	+ 2%
NSF	617	693	766	+ 11%
Agriculture	467	530	579	+ 9%
Other	1,487	1,777	1,787	—12%
Total	20,694	24,461	26,322	+ 8%
R&D Facilities	801	1,455	1,636	+ +
Total, all R&D	21,495	25,495	27,958	+ 8%

Amounts Obligated for Conduct of Basic Research
Obligations ($ Millions)

Agency	1976	1977	1978	% Change 1977-1978
HEW	660	744	796	+ 7.0
NSF	541	612	688	+ 12.4
ERDA	350	389	427	+ 9.8
NASA	298	352	365	+ 3.7
Defense	248	274	314	+ 14.6
Agriculture	171	193	215	+ 11.4
All Other	195	221	236	+ 6.8
Total	2463	2785	3041	+ 9.2

. . . But NIH Budget Brings No Joy for Bethesda

If Mr. Ford's final budget proposals for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) are put into effect, which is unlikely, a great deal of uproar can be expected in the nation's biomedical research laboratories.

The budget calls for NIH spending to be held at about the same level as this year (which would mean a decrease when inflation is factored in). It would also result in the elimination of some cherished research programs, and it would transfer management responsibility for NIH's intramural research to the Assistant Secretary for Health — a proposal which would be particularly unpalatable to biomedical researchers who are already complaining about political control of research by HEW. Congress is unlikely to go along with any of those proposals, however.

Though hard figures are difficult to come by, budget documents distributed by HEW indicate that NIH would receive $2.571 billion in fiscal year 1978, a mere $40 million increase over its current budget.

A particularly noteworthy feature of the proposed budget is that the National Cancer Institute would get an increase of only $4 million, bringing its budget to $819 million. The addition would be earmarked entirely for research programs on occupational carcinogenesis, priorities for which would be established jointly by the National Cancer Institute and the Environmental Protection Agency. The budget proposals also call for expansion of NCI's existing program of testing for environmental carcinogens.

It is the second year running that the Ford budget request has entailed cutbacks in cancer research, a move which reflects the feeling that the high-flying Cancer Institute, whose budget has risen by a factor of five in seven years, is not suffering from lack of money. Last year, however, Congress refused to go along with the proposed cuts and instead added hefty increases. The same routine should be anticipated this year.

A proposal which is sure to raise considerable anguish if it survives passage through Congress is a move to

(Continued on Page 5)

Ford Energy Plan Conflicts with Carter's Design

The lame-duck Ford budget, like his two previous efforts, proposes major increases in funds for nuclear energy research and development, but is unkind to a number of energy programs which Congress, and probably the Carter Administration, holds dear. The actual figures for energy R&D should therefore be treated with considerable skepticism, but they nevertheless provide an important benchmark from which to measure changes of priority brought in by the new Administration.

The key items to watch in the coming weeks are the budget proposals for the liquid-metal fast-breeder reactor (LMFBR) program, which retains pride of place as the nation's most expensive energy R&D program under Ford's proposals.

The total amount proposed for energy research and development depends on how the subject is defined, and which set of figures is used, but according to an analysis put together by the Office of Management and Budget, outlays on direct energy R&D are slated to rise from $2.414 billion to $3.042 billion, a 26 per cent boost. A further $578 million is proposed for closely related environmental and basic research. The bulk of the funding, amounting to $2.8 billion, would go to the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA).

As for the division between nuclear and non-nuclear R&D, a measure which is often reckoned to reflect the real priorities, the budget would result in a slight increase in the proportion devoted to nuclear energy. A total of $1.54 billion is proposed for R&D on fission technologies, nuclear safeguards, uranium enrichment, and regulatory research, a 30 per cent increase from fiscal year 1977.

A good deal of the proposed increase in nuclear R&D would be devoted to programs such as radioactive waste management, assessment of uranium resources, and efforts to develop better safeguards against the theft of nuclear materials, most of which will probably be acceptable to Congress and the Carter Administration. The LMFBR program is a different matter, however.

Outlays on the LMFBR program are slated to go up from $594 million to $736 million, a 24 per cent boost. (Obligations would increase from $686 to $855 million.) The biggest single item in the LMFBR budget is the proposed demonstration breeder reactor, construction of which is scheduled to begin on the Clinch River in Tennessee later this year.

During the election campaign, Carter said that he would reduce the priority of the LMFBR program and perhaps seek foreign participation in it. If he is going to keep his promise, a decision on the Clinch River plant should be made soon, before construction and the purchase of hardware gets too far ahead.

As for conservation research and development, the Ford budget would provide virtually no increases, and it would concentrate entirely on long-term efforts such as improving electrical energy systems and energy storage. The proposals reflect the Ford Administration's view that short-term energy conservation measures should be the responsibility of private industry, with the federal government's role limited to the provision of incentives through regulation. Such views were expressed last year by Mr. Ford when he vetoed a bill to spur the development of electric automobiles (SGR Vol. VI, No. 16).

During the election campaign, however, Carter repeatedly emphasized the need for energy conservation, and his energy adviser, James Schlesinger, has also advocated increased federal efforts to spur conservation. At a briefing for reporters on January 15, ERDA Administrator Robert Seamans Jr. acknowledged that the Ford budget proposals for conservation will provoke some controversy.

Similarly, the Ford budget provides no funds for new

(Continued on Page 6)

NIH *(Continued from Page 4)*

eliminate NIH's General Research Support Grants, block grants to institutions which are not earmarked for any particular program. Ford's budget request would reduce the funds for the Division of Research Resources by $35 million as the first step toward phasing out the general support grants.

The proposal to transfer some management authority for NIH programs to the Assistant Secretary for Health is buried deep in the budget document. It comes in the form of a recommendation that funds for the salaries and expenses of NIH personnel be transferred from the NIH budget to the budget of the Assistant Secretary for Health. A total of $483 million is involved.

According to HEW officials, the idea is to consolidate responsibility for the salaries of all federally employed health personnel within the budget of the assistant secretary, a move which would facilitate manpower planning and make it easier to transfer people from one program to another. Since such a move would increase HEW's direct control over NIH's activities, biomedical researchers, who have recently been complaining about political control of biomedical research, would tend to regard the proposal with outright alarm. Congress is expected to reject the proposal.

NASA Receives Go-Ahead on New Projects

For the first time in several years, officials at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) are relatively happy about the budget requests that have been sent to Congress.

Though the Office of Management and Budget did slice some $176 million from NASA's original proposals, the farewell Ford budget at least provides enough cash for a start to be made on several high-priority, and much-delayed, space science projects. NASA officials are also confident that the incoming Carter Administration will not perform any radical surgery on the agency's budget.

Ford proposed that NASA's total budget should rise to just over $4 billion, an increase of nearly 8 per cent over fiscal year 1977. The bulk of the increase would to go the space shuttle, which would soak up some $1.35 billion, while the rest of NASA's budget would stay about level with inflation. James C. Fletcher, who may be kept as NASA's Administrator by the Carter Administration, noted last week that the budget "continues the policy of fiscal restraint that has characterized NASA budgets in recent years."

The budget would provide funds for two space science projects which NASA was forced to drop last year. They are the Large Space Telescope (LST), a 2.4 meter orbiting telescope which will probably be launched by the shuttle in 1983, and construction of a spacecraft to orbit around Jupiter and send probes into the planet's atmosphere. Both mission have been ranked as top priority projects by the National Academy of Sciences' Space Science Board, and when funds for the LST were squeezed out of NASA's budget last year, astronomers responded with a high pressure, but unsuccessful, lobbying effort to persuade Congress to put the money back in. The total cost of the LST is expected

(Continued on Page 7)

ENERGY *(Continued from Page 5)*

solar energy demonstration projects in fiscal year 1978. In the past couple of years, Congress has pushed the Ford Administration into underwriting the costs of producing, installing, and testing solar heaters, the objective being to force feed the growth of the solar-heating industry. The Office of Management and Budget has been soft-pedaling on the program, however, because the Administration argues that the technology is relatively well developed, and it is up to private industry to commercialize it.

Though the budget contains no funds specifically earmarked for the much-publicized Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI), the site for which is expected to be chosen this spring, Robert Hirsch, head of ERDA's solar energy division, said last week that between $8 and $10 million in solar research would be performed at SERI in fiscal year 1978.

Finally, it should be noted that the energy research and development authorization bills will be considered this year by a new cast of Congressional characters. With the demise of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the expected reorganization of the Senate's committee system, virtually the entire ERDA budget bill will go to the House Committee on Science and Technology and the expanded Senate Interior Committee. —CN

USSR Now 10-ft. Tall in Research

The campaign to persuade the public that the Soviets are enroute to military supremacy over the US has branched out to include basic research, a field in which, by all other accounts, the Soviets are pretty ragged.

The new line was unveiled last week by columnists Evans and Novak, who regularly peddle as indisputable fact whatever is handed to them by the caveman wing of the Pentagon.

Thus, as stated in their column, in the *Washington Post* of January 24:

"Perhaps the most disturbing aspect is the shift between the United States and the Soviet Union in research. At the height of the Cold War, the United States far outdistanced Moscow by spending billions on pure research — scientific experimentation that sometimes led down a blind alley, sometimes led to brilliant breakthroughs.

"Today, with the defense dollar shrunk by inflation, exorbitant personnel costs of the all-volunteer force and competition from non-defense sectors, pure research has virtually ended here. Not so, however, in the Soviet Union, where pure research is encouraged and heavily financed."

According to the National Science Foundation, the combined total of government and non-government spending for basic research last year in the US was $4.8 billion, up 7 per cent from the previous year and easily double the figure of a decade ago. Figures for the Soviet Union are rendered meaningless by secrecy, distorted exchange rates, plus the problems of comparing activities in centrally controlled and mixed economies. But if scientific publication is any measure, the record books show the US to be first worldwide in most fields, with the Soviets usually trailing far behind.

To the Editor: Ford Right to Set up Committee

Dear Editor:

I usually enjoy reading your report. It is a fine and refreshing counterweight to some of the other science-policy journals. However, there is one error in your Dec. 15, 1976 issue that I feel deserves correction.

The error occurs in your lead story concerning Guy Stever's putting in place a science advisory apparatus Carter may not want. You imply that there was something wrong in Stever's appointing a President's Committee on S&T (Science and Technology) in September and that it was part of a rush to put the apparatus in place despite the results of the election. If you read Sec. 302(a)(2) of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act, you will find that the President is required to appoint that committee within 60 days after there is a Director (i.e. science advisor) in office. Now, if you are suggesting that the new science advisor's first act should be to violate the law, that is a very strange suggestion indeed.

I agree that it might have been wiser to seek some guidance on those activities occurring after the election, but do you not feel that there is some value in having a functioning office in place rather than to have it do nothing for the 79 or so days between election and inauguration? Further, if Ford had won, you no doubt would have castigated them for not going ahead. I do feel the point you raise is legitimate, but that you are doing a disservice to a difficult position.

Sincerely,
Harold Federow
Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Editor's Note: Mr. Federow raises a point that SGR should not have neglected. The President was under a legislative mandate to appoint the Committee on Science and Technology within 60 days after the appointment of the presidential science adviser. Since Dr. Stever was sworn in August 12, the 60-day period elapsed considerably before election day, and it was proper for Mr. Ford to proceed in fulfilling his obligation. However, it seems that some cordial accommodation might have been worked out between the letter of the law and the forthcoming election returns. It is not uncommon for the White House to let such legislative deadlines slip for a few weeks. The Committee, after all, will perform the bulk of its duties for an Administration that had no part in its selection. This being so, it might have been prudent to await the election results.

SPACE *(Continued from Page 6)*

to be between $400 and $500 million.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy reviewed NASA's budget plans last fall, and it is said to have played a key role in persuading OMB to allow a start to be made on the LST and Jupiter projects.

Missing from the budget, however, are funds for a planned lunar spacecraft, which would be placed into a polar orbit around the moon; no money has been provided for a follow-up to the successful Viking Mars lander project. Both of those projects have been under intense discussion in NASA.

Spending on the space shuttle, which has been rising rapidly over the past few years, is expected to level out in the late 1970s; this may allow more money to be put into satellite development. As for NASA's next big mission, the agency had requested $15 million for advanced studies of a permanent manned space station, but OMB axed the request.

Senate Report Hits EPA

A bruising analysis of the Environmental Protection Agency's record in regulating pesticides, prepared by the staff of Senator Edward Kennedy's Judiciary subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, has led Kennedy to charge that EPA "has largely failed in its responsibility to assure the safe use of pesticides," and that "EPA has failed the consumer and the farmer as well as the pesticide industry."

The study, which received considerable publicity when it was released early in the New Year, is available without charge from the subcommittee's office, 162 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510. Title: The EPA and the Regulations of Pesticides.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $75☐; two years, $140☐
Individual subscribers: one year, $44☐; two years, $75☐
(Overseas airmail, $17.50 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

Ex-Rep. Mink Gets State Dept. Science Post

Remember that State Department job which Dixy Lee Ray angrily quit in mid-1975 — Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs?

Descended from a long-troubled effort to bring scientific advice into foreign policy formulation, it was subsequently filled by a career diplomat, former Ambassador to Iceland Frederick Irving. Now the Carter Administration is going to turn it over to a former Congresswoman from Hawaii, Patsy Mink, a lawyer by training, who gave up her seat last year in an unsuccessful bid for the Democratic nomination for the Senate.

Ray, who went directly from State to win the governorship of Washington, stormed out of the job after six months, proclaiming that Henry Kissinger not only did not listen to her but, in defiance of the legislation that created her job, had turned her Bureau's responsibilities over to other offices of the Department. A marine biologist and former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, Ray represented what the elders of the scientific community had in mind when, back in the 1950s, they persuaded the Department to set up a science office. Foreign policy, they believed, required a sound scientific input. The idea, however, never caught on with the diplomatic types, and from 1964 to 1974, the office was headed by a career State Department administrator, Herman Pollack. When he retired and Ray was appointed, the elders were pleased.

Irving's appointment signified Kissinger's impatience with uppity scientists who want to meddle in foreign affairs .The selection of non-scientist Mink suggests that those sentiments still prevail in Foggy Bottom. She brings to the job a familiarity with Washington's ways and a Congressional record as a champion of environmental purity. But to the extent that scientific expertise has a role to play in foreign policy, it will not be filled by the new Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs.

Pending Mink's Senate confirmation, Irving remains on the job and then will be reassigned.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106